

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

**WILLIAM DAVID HICKS, JR.,**

**Plaintiff,**

**v.**

Case No. 2:21-cv-11563  
District Judge Denise Page Hood  
Magistrate Judge Anthony P. Patti

**HEIDI WASHINGTON, *et al.*,**

**Defendant(s).**

\_\_\_\_\_ /

**ORDER DENYING REQUEST TO SEAL (ECF No. 54)**

Plaintiff has filed a response to Defendants’ motion for summary judgment on the basis of exhaustion, on which Plaintiff hand-wrote the word *sealed*. (ECF No. 39.) However, the Court **DENIES** any request to seal this response: first, because it fails to comply with my Practice Guidelines for “Protective Orders and Sealing of Records;” second, because it does not comply with Local Rule 5.3 (E.D. Mich. LR 5.3); and, third, because the Court’s own review of the motion response does not reveal highly confidential information that requires sealing. “The courts have long recognized ... a ‘strong presumption in favor of openness’ as to court records,” and the “burden of overcoming that presumption is borne by the party that seeks to seal them.” *Shane Group, Inc. v. Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan*, 825 F.3d 299, 305 (6th Cir. 2016) (citations omitted). “The burden is a heavy one:

‘Only the most compelling reasons can justify non-disclosure of judicial records.’”

*Id.* (quoting *In re Knoxville News-Sentinel Co.*, 723 F.2d 470, 476 (6th Cir. 1983)).

It is **SO ORDERED**.

Dated: August 17, 2022



---

Anthony P. Patti  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE